



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/286,087	04/02/1999	HOCK CHYE GAN	476-1737	4515

7590 03/12/2002

LEE MANN SMITH MCWILLIAMS  
SWEENEY AND OHLSON  
P O BOX 2786  
CHICAGO, IL 606902786

EXAMINER

SOBUTKA, PHILIP

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/286,087

Applicant(s)

GAN ET AL.

Examiner

Philip J. Sobutka

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. Claims 1,2,3,5,13,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Houde et al (US 5,623,532).

Consider claims 1-3,5,13,14. Houde teaches a method for migrating subscriber data associated with subscriber identities from a first HLR node to a second HLR node comprising the step of sequentially for each subscriber to be migrated transferring active subscriber data associated with the identity from the first node to the second node (Houde see especially figs 3,7). Note that Houde teaches a diversion function wherein transactions addressed for a subscriber identity arriving at one node are forwarded to the other node (Houde see especially fig 8), Therefore, the first, diverted, node would be in standby, while the new node is active.

2. Claims 1-3,5,7-10,13,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ericsson et al (US 5,956,637).

Consider claims 1-3,5,13,14. Ericsson teaches migrating data corresponding to subscriber identities between two or more HLRs (Ericsson see especially col 3, lines 10-37). Note that Ericsson teaches diverting transactions from one HLR to the other HLR where the subscriber is active (Ericsson, see especially col 4, lines 28-47). Therefore, the first HLR would be in standby, while the second is active.

As to claim 7, note that the transfer would effectively "disable" the data in the first HLR (Ericsson see especially see especially col 14, lines 11-62).

Art Unit: 2683

As to claims 8-10, note that the routing pointer in the first HLR would effectively change the data in the first HLR to "standby" while the data in the second data HLR would be active (Ericsson see especially see especially col 14, lines 11-62).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. Claims 11,12,15,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houde et al.

Houde teaches everything claimed as shown above except for the method being stored as a program on a computer readable medium. Official Notice is taken that it is notoriously well known in the art to store methods as programs on a computer readable medium. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Houde to store the method as a program on a computer readable medium in order to allow the method to be easily and quickly transferred to another system.

4. Claims 11,12,15,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericsson et al.

Ericsson teaches everything claimed as shown above except for the method being stored as a program on a computer readable medium. Official Notice is taken that it is notoriously well known in the art to store methods as programs on a computer readable medium. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ericsson to store the method as a program on a computer readable medium in order to allow the method to be easily and quickly transferred to another system.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericsson et al (US 5,956,637) in view of Nguyen (US 6,021,327).

Art Unit: 2683

Ericsson teaches everything claimed as shown above except for the data being deleted from the first HLR. Nguyen teaches deleting data from a location register in which a subscriber is no longer active (Nguyen col 1, lines 45-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ericsson to delete the subscriber data from a register where the subscriber was no longer active in order to prevent the registers from filling the databases with information that is no longer needed.

### **Response to Arguments**

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12-10-01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants arguments regarding Houde's migration leaving some of the data at a node active do not reflect the invention as claimed, since the claim does not contain the limitation that some data at a node should be active while other subscriber data is being migrated.

Applicant's arguments regarding Ericsson are not persuasive since, while Ericsson may not be performing the data migration for the same reason, the claims do not distinguish over Ericsson's methods.

### **Conclusion**

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Sobutka whose telephone number is 703-305-

Art Unit: 2683


4825. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Philip Sobutka

Pjs  
March 10, 2002

  
**WILLIAM TROST**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**